UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,751	06/28/2001	Arvind Prabhakar	P5935	1048

7590 02/22/2007

Wagner Murabito & Hao LLP
Two North Market Street Third /Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER	
SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/895,751	PRABHAKAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas E. Shortledge	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11/30/2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Remarks, filed 11/30/2006.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 11/30/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicants argue (Remarks, page 2, paragraph 3) that Lakritz (US 6,623,529 B1) in view of Hamann (6,092,036) fails to teach or suggest creating a first file including a translation of said one or more localizable strings, wherein said creating said first file comprises receiving input from a user specifying a translation of at least one of said one or more localizable strings within said at least one token. However, the examiner disagrees and argues that Hamann teaches while a translation table is being built, a user is able to supply the system with two lines of text, one line being application text in the source language and a second line of text of application text translated into the target language (col. 6, lines 53-61).

In response to applicant's argument that Lakritz and Hamann are nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's

endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Lakritz and Hamann are both directed to the localization of data using translation data stored within a table.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Hamann teaches a multilingual data processing system, that includes a translation table builder, responsive to a user input, for building each text translation table. The translation table building includes a text editor for allowing the user to translate language text items into target language text items. By allowing the user to create supply their own translations of the application text, the users are able to improve the localization process of multilingual data by adapting the translations of the application data to better fit the needs of the user (col. 2, line 66 through col. 3, line 4 and col. 6, line 53 through col. 7, line 12).

The applicant argues (Remarks, paragraph 3, page 5) that Lakritz fails to disclose prompting a user for confirmation of said identifying said one or more localizable strings. The examiner disagrees and argues that once the user begins editing the translation database of Lakritz, the system prompts the user to supply a translation for each of the selected target languages to be included in the translation database (col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67, and col. 29, lines 1-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 1-6, 8-15, 17-24, 26-28, 30-35, 37-42 and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz (US 6,623,529 B1) in view of Hamann (6,092,036).

As to claims 1 and 10, Lakritz teaches:

a markup language document (HTML content, col. 7, line 19);

identifying one or more localizable string within said at least one token (col. 7, lines 27-29)

creating a file including a translation of said one or more localizable strings (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

creating a second file including non-localized data from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said first file and said second file (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

Lakritz does not explicitly teach receiving from input from a user specifying a translation of at least one of said one or more localizable strings.

However, Hamann teaches the user is able to input a string in a source language and a string of text translated into the target language (col. 6, lines 48-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine the methods of Lakritz with the ability to add a translation as taught by Hamann to increase the efficiency of the system by allowing a user to modify and/or a translation to a target text, as taught by Hamann (col. 7, lines 1-10).

As to claim 19, Lakritz teaches:

a processor (a computer, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a processor);

a memory storing program instructions (a computer with applications, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a memory);

identifying one or more localizable string within said at least one token (col. 7, lines 27-29)

creating a file including a translation of at least one said localizable string (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

creating a second file including non-localized data from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said first file and said second file (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

Lakritz does not explicitly teach the program instructions are further executable to receive from input from a user specifying a translation of at least one of said one or more localizable strings.

However, Hamann teaches the user is able to input a string in a source language and a string of text translated into the target language (col. 6, lines 48-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine the methods of Lakritz with the ability to add a translation as taught by Hamann to increase the efficiency of the system by allowing a user to modify and/or a translation to a target text, as taught by Hamann (col. 7, lines 1-10).

As to claims 28, and 35, Lakritz teaches:

identify at least one token within said document (col. 7, lines 27-29);

identify one or more localizable string within said at least one token (col. 7, lines 27-29);

prompting a user for confirmation of said identifying said one ore more localizable string (creating user-defined term databases, where the user is prompted to supply a translation for each language to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30);

extract said one or more localizable string from said document (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

translate at least one of said one or more extracted localizable string (supplying a translation, col. 7, lines 36-40);

extracting non-localizable string from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said extracted non-localizable data with at least one of said translated one or more localizable string and said extracted one or more localizable string (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

Lakritz does not explicitly teach said translating comprises receiving input from a user specifying a translation of at least one of said one or more localizable strings.

However, Hamann teaches the user is able to input a string in a source language and a string of text translated into the target language (col. 6, lines 48-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine the methods of Lakritz with the ability to add a translation as taught by Hamann to increase the efficiency of the system by allowing a user to modify and/or a translation to a target text, as taught by Hamann (col. 7, lines 1-10).

As to claim 42, Lakritz teaches:

a processor (a computer, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a processor);

a memory storing program instructions (a computer with applications, col. 3, lines 25, which would necessarily include a memory);

identify at least one token within said document (col. 7, lines 27-29);

identify one or more localizable string within said at least one token (col. 7, lines 27-29);

prompt a user for confirmation of said identifying said one or more localizable strings (creating user-defined term databases, where the user is prompted to supply a translation for each language to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30);

extract said one or more localizable strings from said document (separating country or regional content from the structure of the document into a separate file, where that file can be updated, col. 7, lines 12-18);

translate at least one said extracted localizable string (supplying a translation, col. 7, lines 36-40);

extracting non-localizable string from said document (separating out the country or regional content into a separate file, leaving the other content in a separate file, col. 7, lines 12-18); and

merging said extracted non-localizable data with at least one of said translated one or more localizable string and said extracted one or more localizable string (finding the correct localization file, and putting the files back together, col. 7, lines 18-20).

Lakritz does not explicitly teach translating at least one of said extracted one or more localizable strings, the program instructions are executable to receive input from a user specifying a translation of at least one of said one or more localizable strings.

However, Hamann teaches the user is able to input a string in a source language and a string of text translated into the target language (col. 6, lines 48-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine the methods of Lakritz with the ability to add a translation as taught by Hamann to increase the efficiency of the system by allowing a user to modify and/or a translation to a target text, as taught by Hamann (col. 7, lines 1-10).

As to claims 2, 11, and 20, Lakritz teaches prompting a user for confirmation of said identifying said one or more localizable strings (users are allowed to edit the information, col. 8, lines 53-56, further creating user-defined term databases, where the

user is prompted to supply a translation for each language to be used, col. 28, lines 24-34 and 63-67 and col. 29, lines 1-30).

As to claims 3, 12 and 21, Lakritz teaches creating a third file including said one or more localizable strings (creating a separate file for each of the country or regions for the content to be translated into (col. 7, lines 12-18), which would necessary include creating a third or more file).

As to claims 4, 13 and 22, Lakritz teaches merging includes merging said third file (merging the files based on the needed translation (col. 7, lines 12-18, and 27-40), where it would be necessary that if the information from the third file was needed, that information would be merged).

As to claims 5, 14, 23, 30, 37 and 44, Lakritz does not explicitly teach editing said first file to modify said user-supplied translation.

However, Hamann teaches the user is able to input or edit a string in a source language and a string of text translated into the target language (col. 6, lines 48-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine the methods of Lakritz with the ability to add a translation as taught by Hamann to increase the efficiency of the system by allowing a user to modify and/or a translation to a target text, as taught by Hamann (col. 7, lines 1-10).

As to claims 6, 15, 24, 31, 38, and 45, Lakritz teaches merging further includes recording said user-supplied translation within said first file into a dictionary module (saving the visitors translations for a later use, col. 8, lines 53-60).

As to claims 8, 17, 26, 33, 40 and 47, Lakritz teaches screening a string of characters with said document whether said string of characters is at least one of bounded and unbounded (finding a string to be translated that is bounded by the tags, col. 7, line 35).

As to claims 9, 18, 27, 34, 41 and 48, Lakritz teaches said one or more localizable string includes at least one of data and executable code (a string in text, col. 7, lines 35-36).

As to claims 32, 39, and 46, Lakritz teaches one of a dictionary translation (using a dictionary translation col. 7, lines 45, and col. 8, lines 53-56).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TS
02/14/07

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER